

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addease COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.webjo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/566,103	01/26/2006	Shihe Xu	DC5160PCT1	9443	
137 DOW CORNI	7590 09/14/200 NG CORPORATION C	EXAM	EXAMINER		
2200 W. SALZBURG ROAD P.O. BOX 994 MIDLAND, MI 48686-0994			LEE, JAE		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2895		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			09/14/2009	FLECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patents.admin@dowcorning.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/566,103	XU, SHIHE	
Examiner	Art Unit	
JAE LEE	2895	

	JAE LEE	2895	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 21 August 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.	
 All The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one or the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance FR 1.114. The reply must be filed	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>9</u> months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period valued as 7 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office there may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL.	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS 3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, t (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett	nsideration and/or search (see NO) w);	TE below);	
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			ie issues ioi
 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 		,	
7. If or purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) I how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed to:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appear and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. 		•	
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).		
/N. Drew Richards/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2895			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant contends that the rationale for 103 motivation utilizing Coulidar et al. is vague and therefore lacks obviousness. Examiner submits, however, that the 103 rationale for using Coulilard et al, namely "to form a functionalized group for further reaction in forming conventional siloxanes" is a vaild 103 rationale since having functionalized ligands in the silicon base atom would enable one of ordinary skill to further react other silicon-based moleties to form a practitioner-discretioned trickness of conventional siloxane. Without functionalized ligands, no further reactions may continue which would enable nearly expected the structure unreactive to forming practitioner-discretioned siloxanes and therefore limits flexibility of the user in the art. Applicant further contends that platinum is no a catalyst for condensations reactions. Examiner, however, posits that absent evidence that states such an assertion, platinum is a condensation cractions and the states such an assertion, platinum in such as condensation reaction and conventional catalyst which is utilized for many reactions including condensation reactions. Examined to the such as a condensation reaction apart from the use disclosed by Hohle et al. In essence, claim 2, for example, merely recites "a condensation catalyst", and does not mention its intended purpose which would have narrowed the use of platinum.

/N. Drew Richards/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2895